

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,544	11/25/2003	Hiroto Sasaki	Hiroto Sasaki Q78669 4391		
7590 10/14/2004			EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,			HUNTER, ALVIN A		
MACPEAK & S	SEAS, PLLC	•			
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20037-3213			3711		

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/720,54	14	SASAKI ET AL.				
		Examine	f	Art Unit				
		Alvin A. H		3711				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state ply received by the Office later than three months after the major part of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no ever reply within the statiod will apply and w atute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be t utory minimum of thirty (30) da ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS froi lication to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered time in the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	4 June 2004.						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ T	his action is n	on-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 8-10 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 4,5 and 7 is/are objected to.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 1) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ a)ĺ	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a line	ents have bee ents have bee priority docume reau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applica ents have been receive 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National	Stage			
Attachmen			_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date	08)		Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claim 6 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Yamada et al. (USPN 5585440). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow. Although allowability has been withdrawn, new search was necessitated by the amending of claims.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on June 24, 2004 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent 6,695,716 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 8, line 4 "Group VIIX" should read –Group VII--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the polybutadiene" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 3711

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gendreau et al. (USPN 4955613).

Regarding claim 8, Gendreau et al. discloses the a golf ball product (one-piece) having the following:

- a) a rubber composition of 100 parts by weight (See Table 1),
- b) 25 to 45 phr of metal salt of an unsaturated carboxylic acid (See Column 4, lines 18 through 24),
 - c) 5 to 25 phr of metal oxide (See column 4, lines 40 through 42),
 - d) about 0.2 to about 2.0 phr of peroxide (See Column 4, lines 18 through 39),
- e) 15 to 85 phr of polybutadiene synthesized with a catalyst of rare earth element having above about 40% cis-1, 4 and a Mooney Viscosity of no greater than 50 (See Column 4, lines 43 through 53). Gendreau discloses a second polybutadiene in 15 to 85 phr synthesized with a Group VIII element having a Mooney Viscosity of no greater than 50 (See Column 4, lines 43 through 53). The second polybutadiene inherently has the same molecular weight and solution viscosity of that claimed by the applicant Gendreau discloses the same composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3711

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (USPN 5585440).

Regarding claim 1 and 9, Yamada et al. discloses a one piece golf ball formed by vulcanization from a rubber composition composed of 100 parts by weight of rubber base material, 5 to 60 parts by weight of unsaturated carboxylic acid, 5 to 60 parts by weight of metal oxide, and 0.1 to 10 parts by weight of organic peroxide wherein the rubber base material contains 60 to 95% by weight based on the weight of a polybutadiene which is synthesized with a catalyst of rare earth element and contains more than 40% of cis-1,4-linkage and has a Mooney Viscosity no less than 50 (See Abstract and Column 5, lines 39 through 46). Though Yamada et al. disclose some of the ranges having lower values that that claimed by the applicant Yamada et al. meets the upper ranges of that claimed by that applicant. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the amounts of material and Mooney Viscosity of that disclosed by Yamada in order to obtain the processabilty and workability desired by the user.

Art Unit: 3711

Regarding claim 2, Yamada et al. inherently discloses the molecular weight distribution Mw/Mn of 2.0 to 8.0 being that Yamada et al. discloses the same composition as that in claim 1.

Regarding claims 6 and 10, Yamada et al. discloses the composition containing 1 to 30 parts by weight of organic sulfur compound (See Column 3, lines 47 through 53).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (USPN 5585440) further in view of Sone et al. (USPN 6642314).

Yamada et al. discloses the use of neodymium as a rare earth element, however, the use of a terminal modifier is not disclosed (See Column 3, lines 51 through 59 of Yamada et al.). Sone et al. discloses a rubber composition wherein a terminal modifier is reacted with the rubber composition after polymerization to increase the workability of the composition (See Column 3, lines 36 through 58). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to react the rubber composition taught by Yamada et al., with a terminal modifier, as taught by Sone et al., in order to further improve the workability of the composition.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5, and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3711

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 703-306-5693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Vidovich, can be reached on 703-308-1513. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/720,544

Art Unit: 3711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAN Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

GREGORY VIDOVICH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700